



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/708,259  | 02/20/2004  | Kurt Andersson       | 73891               | 2258             |
| 30593   | 7590        | 02/15/2007           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.<br>P.O. BOX 8910<br>RESTON, VA 20195 |             |                      | PETERSON, KENNETH E |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 3724                |                  |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE                                |             | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE       |                  |
| 3 MONTHS  |             | 02/15/2007           | PAPER               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/708,259             | ANDERSSON, KURT     |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Kenneth E. Peterson    | 3724                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,8-10,12 and 13 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,8,10,12 and 13 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

1. The amendments filed 03 AUG 06 and 12 Jan 07 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. In claim 12, the forward and following edges are cut off.

In paragraph 0024 of the specification, the held edges "*are considered as wastage and are rejected*". There is no discussion of cutting them. Within the scope of the broad disclosure, they could be ground off by an abrasive grinding machine, so an argument that cutting is inherent is not persuasive. Paragraph 0006 discusses cutting off holding surfaces, but this is discussing the prior art, not the current invention.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, as set forth above.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3724

4. Claims 1,8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uehlinger et al.'001.

In figures 3a,16a and 16b, Uehlinger shows the process of cutting sheets with front and back wavy edges.

Figure 6f shows the step of holding (clamp 118) the edges and conducting an additional machining step (dies cutting with tool 121).

Uehlinger deforms the sheet. For example, see the deformed part in figure 6c. The scrap is considered to be "wave-shaped" to the same extent as disclosed by Applicant's original disclosure. The scrap is cut by a shred cutting guillotine (line 37, column 16) and removed by a scrap conveyor (line 42, column 16).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehlinger et al.'001 in view of Sakaguchi et al.'979.

Uehlinger, as set forth above, shows a method with all of the recited steps except the wavy edge is not quite sinusoidal. However, from the same art of can lid making, Sakaguchi shows that it is well known for the wavy edges to be sinusoidal as seen in figure 3 (12b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have

Art Unit: 3724

modified Uehlinger by making the wavy edge sinusoidal, as taught by Sakaguchi, in order to waste less material.

7. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has overcome some of the previous new matter rejections, but the rejection of claim 12 remains.

Applicant has overcome the drawing objection.

In general, Examiner notes that the original disclosure was focused on the step of cutting the wave-edged pieces, and that it has very little to say on the subsequent machining steps. It may be quite difficult for Applicant to claim the machining step in any way that would be distinguishing.

Applicant argues that Uehlinger does not have the cutting and removing step, but these steps are clearly set forth on lines 37 and 42 of column 16.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

kp

  
KENNETH E. PETERSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER